



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Y4. D63/1: M66/10

MINIMUM WAGE FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN

P92-90

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. R. 10367

STANFORD
LIBRARIES

PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MINIMUM WAGE
SCALE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR
WOMEN AND CHILDREN

APRIL 16, 1918



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1918



Y4. D63/1: M66/10

MINIMUM WAGE FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN

P92-90

HEARINGS

57

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

STANFORD
LIBRARIES

H. R. 10367

PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MINIMUM WAGE
SCALE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR
WOMEN AND CHILDREN

APRIL 16, 1918



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1918

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

BEN JOHNSON, Kentucky, *Chairman*.

ROBERT CROSSER, Ohio.	WILLIAM J. CARY, Wisconsin.
JAMES A. HAMILL, New Jersey.	CARL E. MAPES, Michigan.
J. WILLARD RAGSDALE, South Carolina.	BENJAMIN K. FOCHT, Pennsylvania.
BENJAMIN C. HILLIARD, Colorado.	LOREN E. WHEELER, Illinois.
CARL C. VAN DYKE, Minnesota.	NORMAN J. GOULD, New York.
ANDREW R. BRODBECK, Pennsylvania.	GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM, Massachusetts.
CHRISTOPHER D. SULLIVAN, New York.	WILLIAM E. MASON, Illinois.
MILTON A. ROMJUE, Missouri.	BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD, New York.
ALBERT F. POLK, Delaware.	STUART F. REED, Virginia.
J. J. MANSFIELD, Texas.	
HERBERT J. DRANE, Florida.	

MINIMUM WAGE FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, April 16, 1918.

The subcommittee, consisting of Hon. Benjamin C. Hilliard, Hon. Herbert J. Drane, and Hon. William E. Mason, this day met, Mr. Hilliard (chairman) presiding.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD KEATING, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM COLORADO.

Mr. HILLIARD. We will first hear a statement from Mr. Keating, who is the author of House bill 10367, concerning which we are to have a hearing this morning.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, there are two interesting and significant events scheduled for Capitol Hill to-day. In the Supreme Court the Government, represented by distinguished counsel, will contend that it has a constitutional right to safeguard the well-being of the children of the Nation. The Government will meet that issue boldly; and those who are opposed to the Government's position will, with equal boldness, urge the theory that when the Congress of the United States says children shall not be employed in mills and mines and factories for unreasonable hours Congress is seeking to deprive the owners of those mills and mines and factories and the parents of those children of their "property" without due process of law. I think we may congratulate ourselves that the people of the United States, as represented by Congress and the Executive, do not subscribe to that antiquated doctrine, but that through their chosen representatives they hold that the children are the wards of society, and that they are the property of God alone.

And then, Mr. Chairman, we have this hearing on the proposal to establish here in the District of Columbia, in the Capital of the Nation, a minimum wage for women and children.

These events are significant because they demonstrate that in the midst of war's alarms America is wise enough and farsighted enough to safeguard its women and its children. No nation is stronger than its women. We hear a great deal about the courage of the Spartan mothers. I think we are safe in assuming that they were not underfed, because if they had been their sons could not have held Thermopylae.

After all, that is the issue we have to present to this committee to-day—the question of giving women who work a wage which will be sufficient, at the very least, to buy the necessities of life. In other words, we are contending for the "irreducible minimum"; we are fighting for a living wage.

First, as to the need of this legislation. We have an array of distinguished witnesses here to-day. They will show you that a majority of the wage-earning women of this country receive less than a living wage. It is not necessary for me to stress the importance of that statement to the members of this committee. It means that of the millions of women who go forth in the gray of the morning and do not return to their homes until the twilight of evening more than a majority do not receive a living wage. That is a stinging indictment of our democracy.

And then these witnesses will show from Government reports, from careful investigations made here in the District of Columbia, that the conditions in Washington do not differ in any material particular from the conditions that prevail throughout the Nation. That is the necessity for the law.

Then we will suggest a remedy—the enactment of a minimum-wage law; and we will show you, gentlemen, the progress of this minimum-wage movement, of the initiation of the law in Oregon; how it was combated by certain business interests, finally sustained by the supreme court of the State, and that decision affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

We will contend that there is no serious question concerning the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.

As to the efficacy of it we will produce witnesses showing how it has worked in other States, particularly in the State of Massachusetts. We will show you that although the Massachusetts law has no compulsory feature, the first year after its enactment 6,000 women had their wages increased. They were not startling increases, it is true, but they were increases sufficient to carry the recipients across the line that marks the boundary between near starvation and enough to eat.

Fortunately, here in the District of Columbia we are not to meet with the opposition that this legislation has encountered in other sections. In other States business interests, always fearing new proposals, have bitterly antagonized minimum-wage legislation. Merchants have declared that to attempt to enforce it would destroy their business. The merchants of Washington are more enlightened; the lessons of experience have not been wasted upon them. And this morning, through their chosen representative, Mr. Chairman, they will acquiesce in this legislation. I feel that they have been brought to that conclusion largely by the experience of merchants in other cities.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me a special pleasure to introduce Mr. Charles J. Columbus, who represents the Retail Merchant's Association of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HILLIARD. We shall be glad to hear Mr. Columbus.

STATEMENT OF MR. CHARLES J. COLUMBUS, REPRESENTING THE MERCHANTS' AND MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, FORMERLY THE RETAIL MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. COLUMBUS. Mr. Chairman, the Retail Merchants' Association was recently renamed the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, and I mention that because we want to make it a matter of record.

The board of governors of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association represent 33 different lines of trade in Washington. While numerically the smallest unit, department stores, nevertheless, are the largest employers that we have here in the District of Columbia, aggregating probably 5,000 employees.

I come here this morning to tell you, Mr. Chairman, and through you the Members of Congress, that the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association is absolutely unopposed to this legislation and favors it. [Applause.]

Business men realize, and must realize, that their best interest lies in the welfare of their employees. Show me a disorganized and upset and unsuccessful business and I will point you at the same time to a business where there is a lack of cohesion, of cooperation, of good will, and interest on the part of the employee.

Washington business men, I think, have possibly a better record than the business men in most cities. We put through a false-advertising law and a fake-auction law, measures that might be supposed to adversely affect business, and they do restrain the dishonest merchant. We are anxious to have business clean, and in order to eliminate still further unreasonable competition—and competition in wages is just another form of competition—the association has decided that after the first of the month next discounts of every character shall be eliminated. By doing that we will the better be able to increase salaries rather than to give discounts to a favored few because they happen to belong to some society organized for that purpose.

Besides the department stores that I refer to, we have 12 laundries in our membership, the largest in the city. We are organized under the unit plan. Each trade association or body meets and elects a chairman, and that chairman is automatically made a member of the board of governors. And so our board of governors took this action yesterday. With respect to the laundries, I called on the laundries in person—not all of them, but as many as I could, the larger ones—and they said all right. I saw all of the department stores. Henry T. Offerdinger, speaking for the cigar trade, said he welcomed such a plan as this. As a matter of fact, this plan of a board or commission that will have the authority from time to time, if need be, to establish in a definite way, in the good old arbitration fashion, what shall constitute a minimum wage appeals to us as the fairest method possible. We would, I have no doubt, bitterly oppose a bill that would establish a flat minimum wage as a law—that is to say, that there should be a given wage now, because it might be unfair to both sides. We in Washington believe that this National Capital has just started its real growth, and that being the case we want to see the worker receive a living wage. The plan as proposed by Mr. Keating certainly appeals to us, and we hope it will be adopted as a law. [Applause.]

MR. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, before introducing the next witness. I want to read to the committee a resolution adopted by the thirty-third annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Seattle, Wash., November 10 to 22, inclusive, 1913, on the subject of minimum-wage legislation.

The question is often asked, Why attempt to control the wages of women and children through legislation and not attempt by the same

method to regulate the wages of men? The answer is not far to seek. Men are better able to protect their interests through organization, and, in addition to organization, men have had another powerful weapon which they have not hesitated to use and which has been denied women—that is, the ballot. I trust the day will soon come when women will be equipped with this most powerful of all weapons. [Applause.]

But pending that, while women wage earners are still unorganized, while women generally are deprived of the ballot, it is necessary for the legislative branch of Government to step in and protect their interests, and that thought has been very well expressed in this resolution, which I will read to the committee. It is as follows:

Under the caption of "Minimum wage legislation," the executive council discusses at much length the efforts that have been made in the several States in the direction of securing the enactment of laws to provide a minimum wage for certain classes of unprotected workers, principally women and children. It reports that nine States have passed minimum-wage laws, and that bills for that purpose are pending in Congress. The executive council concludes its report under this caption with the following recommendation:

"We recommend that in all minimum-wage laws the organized workers should see to it that provision is made for the representation on minimum-wage boards of the organized wage earners, and that the laws are so changed, or drawn and administered, as to afford the largest measure of protection for women and minor workers that they are designed to protect.

"Your committee recommends that the action of the executive council in connection with this subject matter be concurred in, and that the recommendations of the executive council be indorsed and approved as the expression of this convention."

The report of the committee was adopted by unanimous vote.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the attitude of organized labor.

It is now my pleasure to present to you Mrs. Florence Kelley, the secretary of the National Consumers' League. In that connection, permit me to say that we are here to-day because of the untiring efforts of a comparatively small band of women led by Mrs. Florence Kelley and Miss Goldmark. These are the women who, throughout the length and breadth of this land, have carried on the fight for legislation to protect women and children in industry.

Mrs. Kelley's father was a distinguished Member of this House, at one time "the father of the House." His name was known from the Atlantic to the Pacific because of his achievements in political life. His daughter has devoted herself to championing the cause of the weaker side, and her name, too, is known from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf, because of the good she has been able to accomplish for those who are not able to protect themselves.

It affords me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to present Mrs. Kelley to you, and she will introduce the other witnesses. [Applause.]

STATEMENT OF MRS. FLORENCE KELLEY, SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL CONSUMERS' LEAGUE.

Mrs. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman and Representatives, while Mr. Keating is quite right in saying that our organization consists chiefly of women, we are not all women. Our president is Mr. Baker, the Secretary of War; and we have among our members many able men. Before introducing one of them as the next speaker, I wish to read

two telegrams that have come, because we have no one here to bear testimony to the working of the minimum-wage laws on the Pacific coast at the present moment. These telegrams are evidence as to their effect where they have been in effect for some years. The first comes from a large employer, the famous Emporium Store in San Francisco. Mr. Schlesinger, the general manager, telegraphs:

At the request of the Industrial Welfare Commission of California, we are glad to assure you that we have operated under the minimum-wage law for women for the past six months and find it not only beneficial for our employees but for ourselves as well. We feel that the mercantile community in the East, when its operation is better understood, will agree with the majority of the merchants here that it is wise and progressive legislation.

B. F. SCHLESINGER,
General Manager of the Emporium.

And the second telegram comes from the Industrial Welfare Commission of San Francisco:

Minimum-wage orders affecting 20,000 mercantile women went into effect last September. We have to date issued four infirm licenses. Laundry orders affecting 6,000 women went into effect last January. We have issued 70 infirm licenses. We have had practically no objections to the \$10 minimum wage, and have many expressions of approval from employers.

INDUSTRIAL WELFARE COMMISSION.

It gives me very great pleasure to introduce as the next speaker Mr. Felix Frankfurter, to whose skillful presentation of the constitutional argument in behalf of the Oregon minimum-wage law, I believe, we very largely owe the fact that legislation of this character is now allowed to stand as a reasonable exercise of the police powers of Oregon and of other States.

Mr. HILLIARD. The committee will have pleasure in hearing Mr. Frankfurter.

STATEMENT OF MR. FELIX FRANKFURTER.

Mr. FRANKFURTER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my own is a very easy task this morning; but, I take it, a very necessary one, because the threshold question in all social legislation in this country is the inquiry as to its constitutionality. Is this legislation constitutional? Naturally that is the question that will at the outset arise in the minds of you gentlemen, in the minds of your full committee, and in the minds of Congress.

I think one can be as sure as one can be in answering any constitutional proposition that this law is constitutional, and that in passing it Congress will exercise its rightful power, and in passing it, as I believe it should, it will be exercising its unquestioned duty to meet a very urgent social situation.

We usually envelop constitutional questions with a great deal of mystery, because constitutional points are usually raised by those who think that the Constitution was intended as an obstruction, as a strait-jacket, instead of as a means of organic growth and continuous change for a great nation. I take it the constitutional question can be stated, and should be stated, so simply that every citizen ought to be able to see exactly what the issues at stake are, and ought to be able to see by irresistible logic why an answer of constitu-

tionality must be given to the legislation now proposed to you gentlemen.

Chief Justice Marshall said it all a hundred years ago when he said the test of constitutionality is just this:

Are the means appropriate to a legitimate end of legislation? And, if so, if the ends are legitimate, if what you are trying to accomplish are the kind of things a legislature should accomplish, and if the means bear a relation of adaptability, of appropriateness to the end, if it is the kind of a thing that a sensible man would do in order to meet a given situation, then the legislation is constitutional, unless there is some specific prohibition in the Constitution against it.

What are the ends which this legislation seeks to accomplish? What is it all about? What is proposed to you, gentlemen, to be enacted into law? It is just this: that the exclusive responsibility rests with the Congress of the United States for the life and the health and the moral tone of the women and children in industry in the District of Columbia; and, secondly, to secure such conditions, to the extent that legislation can secure them, so that there will not be a remediable pressure of poverty or unnecessary temptations affecting the moral standards of the community. In a word, this legislation says that modern industrial conditions have created new problems, have created a new situation, by the extensive entry of women into industry. And that brings upon Congress the responsibility of seeing to it that the women and minors so engaged in industry should have health, not only for their own sakes but for the sake of an unimpaired decent civilization to follow. There can not be any argument about it at the end, that the aim of this legislation as declared so clearly and conclusively in its title, "A bill to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia," is a subject matter within the legitimate sphere of congressional legislation. I take it that there is no subject matter more pertinent to the legislative power than the subject of this legislation, to protect the lives and the health and the morals of the women and the children who are in industry.

The next question then is, What are the means that are suggested to accomplish those ends? What is it proposed to do in order to protect the health, which is threatened, which has been impaired, in order to remove needless dangers to morals? What is it that is suggested that you, gentlemen of Congress should do, and Congress can not fail to do if it is doing its duty, to enact into legislation? The remedy proposed is this: That no woman and no minor should be allowed to be engaged in industry, unless there is furnished such a worker the bare minimum pittance, sufficient to maintain a decent bodily existence. The mere statement of it would seem to be so elementary that the ancient visitor from Mars, if he were entering this room, would say: "Can it be that that standard of minimum livelihood is not yet in existence in the District of Columbia? Can it really be that in the stress of war Congress must occupy its time to pass such legislation? Can it be that that is a standard not long since actually in operation at the very seat of the Nation's Capitol?" It can be and it is. Testimony is incontestable that there is need for the legislative, coercive power to say no one should engage women or minors, that women and minors should not be allowed by the pressure of want to work at a wage which will not be sufficient

to keep body and mind—I do not think there is enough left over for soul—together.

If that is true—and the very creditable, the very truly patriotic attitude of the merchants in this District of Columbia can leave no doubt on the subject—it simply means that legislation is asked from you gentlemen, as it so frequently is, to impose the prevailing decent standard upon the minority cut-throat competitors. What this legislation in effect amounts to is the demand that Congress should come to the support of decent employers, to save them from the inroads of stupidity and selfishness of selfish or ignorant competitors.

What alternatives are open as to the situation that Dr. Meeker and others will reveal, the inadequacy, the poverty, the below the minimum life level in this District—we might say we can not do anything about it; it is a visitation of God, “For the poor always ye have with you.” I sometimes suspect that it is probably a false text in the Gospel. Surely the poor have ceased to be with many communities, or at least the poor have been eliminated to an extraordinary degree where this very legislation has been tried. I do not need to waste many words on any doctrine of selfish laziness bolstered up by a misuse of a biblical text.

It might be said that there is sufficient economic power on the part of the workers to begat decent wages. That undoubtedly is true as to men workers in great parts of the country. It undoubtedly is not true as to women workers. The reasons for that are clear. The shift of personnel, the constant change, the youth, the natural weakness, particularly the weakness that tradition has imposed upon them and the weakness of lack of political power, these and other conditions combine to make women unequal in a contest for decent conditions if they are left to their own resources. You can not leave them to their own fighting power. The only answer is the answer that is made by this bill. It is not an answer of speculation; it is not something thought out in the mind of Mrs. Kelley, though out of her brain have come many wise things. It is the answer made by experience.

You, gentlemen, in turning to the problems of this District, desiring to meet evils as they should be met, find that this scheme of legislation arose away back in 1894 in New Zealand, in a community considerably like unto our own, the same legal conditions, the same background. It led them to realize that these civil orders and real conditions can not be left to that brutal thing called “the law of supply and demand,” because the law of supply and demand as the President not so very long ago had occasion to say, too often is a law, if left unregulated, of unlimited selfishness. So New Zealand in 1894, and Victoria and New South Wales and the various constituent members of the Australian Commonwealth, and finally Australia itself, adopted the wage-board idea. What is it? It lays down the general principle that a competent worker must have enough food, clothing, and shelter and the other essentials to keep life going, in order to get an adequate output from such a competent worker. In addition to that, a competent worker should mean also a competent citizen. An industrial commonwealth which does not make for decent citizenship is an industrial commonwealth that had

better be buried as quickly as possible. The postulate of the Australian legislation is that if people are well fed and have adequate leisure they will be not only competent workers but also competent citizens, and without one we can not have the other, and without both civilization is not worthy of its name.

And Australia has been giving us the laboratory of experimentation. As answered by actual results, all the fears of timid brains, all the fears of selfish hearts, have been refuted.

So the legislation spread from the great child of Great Britain to the mother country, and in 1909, and later in 1912, Great Britain adopted this wage-board legislation, experimentally, first in four industries, then in four more, and then in still more and still more, until the other day, as Mr. Asquith said in a speech, the beneficent gains of the wage-board legislation have helped England enormously in maintaining decent standards among the workers during the war, and the principle will unquestionably be extended to other industries.

From England it spread to this country, not in any one community, but all over the country—Oregon and Arizona, Massachusetts and Arkansas, Kansas and Wisconsin—here and everywhere. Whatever variations of feelings of peoples, of classes of labor there may have been, we find the adoption of this conservative, tried piece of legislation.

We come to you now not only with the experience of Australia, not only with the experience of England, not only with the experience of countries that in themselves are most significant, because they so much correspond to our own traditions and our own way of looking at life and industry and law; but we come to you this morning with the experience of this legislation in several of the great industrial States of the United States. It has been tried, and the answer to all the mass of opposition is that it has worked.

I see Father Ryan here, to whom we are immeasurably indebted for the progress of this legislation, and there were days when he had to argue for this legislation by putting hopes against fears. Now, he can put actual experience against discredited prophesy. Oregon, Massachusetts, and the other States have tried it, and it has worked.

Now we come to you, gentlemen, as the trustees not merely of the women and children of the District of Columbia, but we came to you as trustees of decent social standards for the whole United States. Therefore every piece of legislation such as this is to be judged not merely on its immediate effect on the comparatively limited industrial activities of the District, but is to be judged of as a test of good faith on the part of the whole United States, where it, and it alone, has jurisdiction, that the needs of democracy, the needs of decency, the needs of good faith that we talk about really have the vitality and the truthfulness of action.

Really that is all there is to the constitutional question. If the means are appropriate to ends that are legitimate—and the ends are legitimate and the means are appropriate—then Chief Justice Marshall's test is answered, because there is not any limitation upon your powers—you being for the moment Congress—to deal with evils in the District of Columbia—to maintain its health, to prevent deterioration of character.

There is not anything in the Constitution, of course, which says that you shall not pass a law of this sort. The only question that

arises, one that will arise in your minds, is the fifth amendment, the limitation that there shall be no legislation passed which interferes with life, liberty, or property without due process of law. But the Supreme Court has now taken us completely "out of the woods" as to that clause, and said, in effect, that if there is a real evil to be remedied, and if there is a reasonable mode taken to remedy that evil, and if all the interests are protected by giving the people affected a hearing, by enabling them to go before the courts before their property is finally taken, that that constitutes due process, because "due process" is simply an old-fashioned phrase for the simple idea that you must not be oppressive and you must not be spoliative.

Mr. MASON. May I interrupt you just a minute while my mind is on that?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. Certainly.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Keating spoke of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Oregon case. Was that the opinion by Justice Brewer?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. I think, Senator Mason, you are referring to a case on woman labor. The thing Mr. Keating referred to, if I may now go to that—

Mr. MASON. I will not interrupt you.

Mr. FRANKFURTER. You are not. I want to be interrupted.

Mr. MASON. Somewhere during your statement please give me the title of the case.

Mr. FRANKFURTER. I will give it to you right now. The course of the litigation was this, Senator Mason: The case came up before the Oregon Supreme Court under the Oregon constitution, which has a clause which, of course, you are familiar with—a due-process clause, as every State constitution has; and in *Stettler v. O'Hara* (69 Oreg., 519) they sustained the legislation.

Mr. MASON. Was that legislation in the State similar to the Keating bill here?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. Precisely. The Keating bill follows, except with necessary variations, the Oregon legislation. It is similar not only in structure but in very language, because it was deemed important where legislation has been approved by the courts to continue that form of legislation.

A reargument was asked, on the theory that the Supreme Court of Oregon had not paid due attention to the fourteenth amendment and had not considered the case in that light. The Supreme Court of Oregon thereupon reconsidered the question, and in *Simpson v. O'Hara* (70 Oreg., 261) found it constitutional under the fourteenth amendment. That case was then brought by writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States. It was argued late in 1915—the case was held for some time; the court then asked for reargument, and the reargument took place early in 1917. That case was argued last year, and, by a divided court, the decision was affirmed (243 U. S., 629) without opinion.

Mr. MASON. That was some time last year?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. That was some time last year, Senator Mason, about May or June.

Following that there have been two opinions by State supreme courts. In *State v. Crowe* the Arkansas Supreme Court in 1917

(97 S. W., 4) sustained this legislation. And very recently, early this year, in a very able and very interesting opinion, the Supreme Court of Minnesota sustained this legislation in *Williams v. Evans* (165 N. W., 494).

Mr. DRANE. Is the legislation in Oregon and the legislation in Arkansas very similar?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. Quite.

Mr. DRANE. Quite similar?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. Quite similar; and the legislation in Minnesota is practically identical.

Mr. DRANE. And now I ask you if the legislation in the various States of the United States is very similar to that which originated in Australia?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. It is, with the exception of two States, Mr. Drane. The legislation is in force in 12 States. In 10 States it is in substantially the Australian idea, namely, the creation of a wage board, which, as Mr. Columbus so pertinently said, will look into the facts in each industry to see what are actually the factors that bear on a worker's budget and what are the factors that bear on the cost of living and the other factors of the problem.

Mr. DRANE. May I ask you to name these 10 States?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. It is Arkansas, California, Colorado, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin. Arizona has a different type of legislation. Arizona and Utah both have different types of legislation; and, if I may say, a very unscientific and crude type of legislation. Instead of having wage boards to make careful inquiry into each separate industry, to hear all sides, Arizona and Utah fix a flat legislative level for the whole State, for all industry, similar to the flat level of congressional legislation as to Federal employees. I say "crude" with entire respect, meaning simply this, that the facts of industry are so different in different portions of the State, which create different conditions, that it seems to me the wise, the conservative thing to do what Massachusetts, to do what Oregon, and what is proposed in this bill, namely, to have separate boards for each industry, in order to allow for the varying factors in the problem.

Mr. DRANE. That is a wise provision.

Mr. FRANKFURTER. But the other 10 States, Mr. Drane, followed entirely the Australian idea, and the bill now before you is almost in very words—except in so far as you had to make changes to meet the political structure of the District—in very words follows the Oregon legislation.

Senator Mason, those cases—

Mr. MASON (interposing). You will furnish the chairman of the committee with the list?

Mr. FRANKFURTER. Surely. That covers all the actually reported decisions before the courts.

We have taken the liberty of putting before you, gentlemen, a book that is terrifying in looks, and we do not even mean to suggest that it should be read from cover to cover. It is the brief that was submitted on behalf of Oregon in support of the minimum-wage law of that State; and this enormous and terrible looking volume has

two parts to it. Fifty pages in the beginning cover the legal argument, and the other 700 pages are a survey of the whole world as to the facts that support the theory which was advanced in the legal argument, namely, the history of the legislation in other countries and in the American States; the economical evils which induced such legislation; it sets forth the results of the legislation where it has been tried. And the Supreme Court has recognized again and again, as for instance in the Oregon 10-hour decision to which Senator Mason had reference, by Justice Brewer, that constitutional questions like this must be decided in the light of the pertinent social facts.

Mr. Keating referred at the outset to the fact that, in the midst of war, you gentlemen are asked to deal with this matter of living wages for women, and at the same time the Supreme Court of the United States is passing on the constitutionality of the child-labor law. Official work took me to England a short time ago, and it was very striking, in many ways the most inspiring thing I brought back from England, that while in the very throes of life and death, one measure on the calendar of the House of Commons, as part of the war legislation of the British Cabinet, was a bill to increase the school age of children up to 14 years, and a mothers' bill to establish continuation schools from 14 to 18; a bill, in a word, which is an attempt to put into effect at home the principles of civilization and democracy for which England is fighting on the battle field. And it seems to me the same kind of significance is to be attached to this hearing. Nothing but war work justifies any of us in being here this morning; nothing but the very things for which the war is being fought, justifies our expenditure of energy and time at this moment. But I take it we would be untrue to those very principles of right and justice if we did not propose this very legislation, if this legislation is not reported and adopted as the best test of the faith that is in us. What are we fighting for? For a real civilization that is to be gentle and strong and decent. This legislation is directed to that very end. We talk about mobilizing the resources of the country for war. This is legislation that really mobilizes the indispensable resources of the State, in protecting the womanhood and childhood of the country. It is in that aspect that this legislation is put before you. [Applause.]

Mrs. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, some years ago, at the urgent request of the Consumers' League, the District Committee put into one of the appropriation bills successfully an item for gathering facts as to the cost of living here, as an economical basis for future legislation. Commissioner Meeker, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has not only availed himself of that appropriation to gather the essential facts, but has made them available by publishing them serially and currently in the Monthly Review, published by his bureau, and giving us the very latest word with regard to the cost of living, particularly of the people concerned here in the District, and Commissioner Meeker shows his abiding interest in the subject by coming here, ill, suffering from the consequences of an operation on his throat, yet willing to give his testimony to the committee.

I have keen pleasure in introducing Commissioner Meeker.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROYAL MEEKER, COMMISSIONER OF LABOR
STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.**

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as stated by Mrs. Kelley, the cost of living investigation that was made in the District of Columbia was made under authorization of joint resolution of Congress. It consisted really of three parts, as it finally was worked out by me and my advisers in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The first part was a study of family budgets, the second part was a study of the income and expenditures of working women, and the third part was a dietary study, analyzing in detail the expenditures and what was received for expenditures for food by 31 families that were studied intensively in cooperation with the Agricultural Department.

I may say, as an aside, that the study cost a great deal more than Congress appropriated, but I felt amply justified in making the additional expenditure because of the value of the results obtained, as it seemed to me.

I am rather sorry, gentlemen, that I did not have the first three articles which appeared in the series, which were published in the October, November, and December issues of the Monthly Review, included with the three articles which you have before you this morning, but I shall have those articles excerpted and placed in your hands as soon as possible. Of these three first articles the first two related to the family-budget study; the third one, the December article, gave the results of the intensive dietary study. They are extremely significant and pertinent to the matter that is before you now, gentlemen. Those family budgets show the contributions made to the family income by working wives and working children, and that, of course, comes directly under your cognizance now, and it is therefore of importance that you should have all the facts that we ascertained in this study at your disposal now. The three articles which have been clipped together and put before you deal with the results obtained in the study of the working women in the District of Columbia.

There are a few quotations that I will beg leave to read, because I think they are of some significance. The first quotation that I wish to call to your attention is found on the first page of the first article. (Reading:)

The study was confined to women receiving incomes less than \$1,100 a year. The study must not be regarded as a study in philanthropy, poverty, and crime because of this exclusion of the higher incomes. The fact is, very few working women receive more than \$1,000 a year. The vast majority receive much less than \$1,000 a year, and these are the socially significant women wage earners. It is of immense importance to know how these women live, whether they live at home or away from home, whether their meager earnings are supplemented out of the general family funds or whether their earnings must support the wage earner and help out the insufficient income of the family, and whether they obtain sufficient nourishment, clothing, and the other essentials to enable them to live healthy and comfortable lives.

Except in a few very unusual cases, such as protracted illness, no woman was included who had not worked during at least nine calendar months of the year 1916, unless the occupation was seasonal in character and so failed to furnish nine months' employment during the year. Thus the merely occasional or intermittent workers were excluded and the study limited to women who were regularly engaged in wage-earning employments.

This study is based upon schedules for the year 1916, secured through personal visits and interviews by agents of the bureau. These interviews were

obtained either at the girl's home or her place of employment, in the latter case through the cooperation of her employer, who allowed her to be questioned during working hours. In almost all instances the women visited were willing to give the desired information. In the final tabulation of results only those schedules were used in which the information obtained was believed to be complete and accurate.

The total number of schedules thus obtained was 676, of which 600 were from white women and 76 from colored women. The present article is concerned solely with the former group, inasmuch as the industrial employment and living conditions of the two races were found to be too dissimilar to permit of combined treatment. Also, it is to be noted that this article is limited to a general consideration of the personal and working conditions of the 600 white wage-earning women. An analysis of their living conditions—housing, food, clothing, etc.—will appear in a succeeding article.

INDUSTRIES AND OCCUPATIONS REPRESENTED.

The employments engaged in by the 600 women were as follows: United States Government employees, 63; office clerks, stenographers, and cashiers in private employment, 172; saleswomen, 192; telephone operators, 38; factory workers, 95; waitresses in hotels and restaurants, 12; and laundry workers, 28.

The employments here represented may be taken as fairly typical of woman's work in the District of Columbia, although the numbers shown are not necessarily proportionate to the total numbers engaged in the several industries. This is particularly true of the employees of the Federal Government, as no effort was made to cover at all fully the better paid Government employees. Of the 63 for whom schedules were obtained, the majority were operatives and printers' assistants at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The others were clerks and stenographers in various departments, employees of the Congressional Library and Capitol, and one charwoman. Two school-teachers and one librarian employed by the District of Columbia are also here included as Government employees.

I think the series of articles which will constitute very largely the finished report is well worth perusal from beginning to end.

I think that is a very significant thing. We took only the lower income groups for making this study of the working women, for, as I have stated in this article, they are the socially significant working women to be considered. I am extremely sorry that I arrived too late to hear the testimony of the person representing the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association. It certainly is gratifying to me to learn that this association has taken a stand for a minimum-wage bill as provided. In view of this stand taken by this association, perhaps I need not dwell upon the significance of the fact that we excluded the higher income groups, the higher paid Government clerks and stenographers.

If it was necessary, and Congress thought it necessary, to increase the salaries of the Government clerks, it is then so much the more necessary to fix a minimum wage or salary for the women employed in private enterprise. I will revert to that later.

There is another quotation that I wish to read, which seems to me to be exactly in line with one of the statements so forcefully made by Mr. Frankfurter in regard to a minimum of subsistence wage, at least for women employees and minors. It is found on pages 6 and 7 of the Monthly Review of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, volume 6, January, 1918, No. 1. The article says:

Nevertheless, the wage rates at which this group of 600 women were working are very significant, and particularly so when studied in relation to the number of years at work. That an inexperienced girl or woman should start work at a low wage is not especially important, although the wage of apprentice girls

should bear some relation to the cost of living. There is a widespread notion, however, that a woman who lives at home ought to be willing and grateful to work for wages insufficient to support a woman living independently of all family assistance. Aided and abetted by this hoary economic fallacy, many parasitic industries and trades have been able to live and even to achieve much prosperity on the subsidies contributed by working women. It ought not to be necessary to point out that no woman who is mentally competent and who has worked at an occupation long enough to acquire proficiency ought to be required or requested to work for a wage insufficient to enable her to live in reasonable comfort. Industries or occupations, if such there be, which can not live except on the subsidies from family incomes contributed by exploited women and child workers, ought to die—the sooner the better for the Nation and the world at large.

Turning now to page 9, Table 1, in the first article, I want to call attention to some significant facts. You will see that in this table are presented, classified by income groups, the wage earners or occupations, and also subclassified into those living at home and those living away from home, and, furthermore, those who were assisted and those who were self-supporting, whether living at home or living away from home.

You will note that the first group of employees treated in this table are the United States employees. I wish to call your attention again to the fact that we took no salaries above \$1,100. That excluded automatically the stenographers and clerks who have been in the service for any considerable length of time. It confined the consideration of Government clerks to those employed in the Congressional Library, in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and a few employees of the Government Printing Office. So that these are the lower-paid Government employees. They are classed as Government employees not because their employment is different from other mechanical workers but because the tenure of their positions is entirely different, and their wage scale is also entirely different, as is shown by the record. You will note that only three of these lower-paid Government employees receive less than \$500 a year, 3 out of 63. The next group is office employees. Of course, that constitutes stenographers and clerks of a kind working in private employment. In the group 101 out of 172 receive less than \$500 per annum. In the next group, saleswomen, 146 out of 192 received less than \$500 per annum. That is, more than 75 per cent receive less than \$500. The next group, telephone operators, 15 out of 38 receive less than \$500. The next group, factory workers, and that term is hardly synonymous in the District of Columbia with factory workers in general, because the only factories in the District of Columbia are cigar factories—not very important—box factories, and I think a few clothing manufacturing establishments, not of much importance. In that group 82 out of 95 of such factory workers receive less than \$500 a year.

The next group, waitresses, is not highly significant, because it is virtually impossible to determine just what the waitress gets, what she receives in salary. But of that group as it stands, 9 out of 12 receive less than \$500 per annum.

The next group, laundry workers, 25 out of 28 receive less than \$500.

The highest salary group in the table is that between \$800 and \$1,100. Fifteen out of 63 Government employees receive salaries between \$800 and \$1,100; 15 office employees out of 172 receive from

\$800 to \$1,100. Four saleswomen out of 192 received that. No telephone operators, of course, received a salary as high as that, because it seems to be the view of the telephone companies that a telephone operator is a telephone operator only preceding her marriage, which accounts for the large turnover or labor in the telephone operating business and the consequent poor service that we are suffering from.

Mr. MASON. That probably accounts for the service.

Mr. MEEKER. Very largely.

Mr. HILLIARD. It would be satisfactory to the committee if, in view of your physical condition, you desire, instead of speaking, to submit your remarks and have them incorporated in the hearing.

Mr. MEEKER. I should be very glad to do that.

Mr. HILLIARD. We are glad to hear you, but if you are suffering any inconvenience we will be glad to let you do that.

Mr. MASON. I will promise you that the committee will read what you put in, because we are interested in what you have said.

Mr. MEEKER. I think I have said practically all that is worth while saying in the articles that have appeared from time to time in the *Monthly Review*. Of course, a much more complete analysis could be made of the facts obtained than was possible in these brief articles, which were rather hurriedly prepared under my supervision, and I would be glad to submit an additional statement.

Mr. HILLIARD. Whatever matter you wish to insert will be put in the record.

Mrs. KELLEY. Mr. Holcombe, of Massachusetts, is here, and I shall call upon him to speak next.

Mr. HILLIARD. Representative Olney would like to say a word right here.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD OLNEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I am thoroughly in accord with the aims, intent, and purposes of the Keating bill, and before this splendid audience I wish to commend his good work to you in Congress, than whom there is no better friend of labor.

Occasionally in life we find the hard-hearted employer. Most of them, I am happy to say, I believe are humanitarians; but oftentimes, unhappily, they do not recognize the real worth and usefulness of the machine. I know something about the minimum-wage question, for I was appointed to the original wage commission of Massachusetts six or seven years ago by the then Gov. Foss. Other members of the board were Dr. Lefavour, president of Simmons College; John Golden, the labor leader; George Anderson; and the woman member, a great humanitarian, Mrs. Elizabeth Glendover Evans.

We held something like 30 executive and open sessions on underpaid women, and then we filed our report. We investigated conditions in Boston, Mass., especially investigating the so-called oppressed industries, where the wages of the employee were supposed to be under the living wage. These oppressed industries consisted of those who worked in the cotton mills, the steam laundries, the candy factories, the brush factories, and the department stores. We went so

far in our investigations as to learn that there were 264 young women in the city of Boston sleeping in rooms with no window, and in all cases investigated we found the wages of these young women to be an average of \$5.50, and they were employed generally in department stores, and they often came from some of the Northern and Southern States, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, coming into Boston with no homes, and obliged to hire rooms by the week for from \$1 to \$2 a week. A dollar a week would provide the young girl with a room with no window. With \$1.50 room the young girl was allowed to cook by gas in the morning her breakfast meal. Supposing she got her own meal and allowed 25 or 30 cents for the noonday meal and 30 cts for supper, with car fare and the medical attendance that is always necessary, this poor, forlorn girl, not living at home, could not subsist, we found out, upon less than \$7 to \$8 a week. In some cases, particularly in one department store in the city of Boston, we found conditions too horrible to depict. Certain officials in this department store when approached by the young girl as to her wage in a certain employment would say to her, "The wage here for department store clerks is from \$5 to \$6." The girl would naturally say, "I can not live upon such a small pittance." He would indicate to her that there were other methods by which she could go out on the street and make up the difference between the \$5 or the \$6 and what should be a living wage, \$9 or \$10.

Our commission made its report, and the majority said there should be a compulsory minimum wage established in all so-called oppressed industries. I submitted a minority report in which I suggested features of recommendation, believing that more might be done with molasses than with vinegar, and that perhaps we could do more that way than by clubbing the employers, so to speak, into submission by compelling a certain wage. The committee on labor of the Massachusetts Legislature, I am happy to say, adopted my minority report, and a permanent minimum wage body was established in Massachusetts with the recommendatory features contained in it.

In substance, where an industry is investigated there is a jury appointed with the pay of the modern jury, six representatives of the employees, six representatives of the employers, and three outsiders. This system has worked out to the queen's taste. In other words, we first started in with the brush-making industry, and the wage there was lifted by recommendation from \$5.50 to \$9, a living wage. The commission then next tackled the candy factories, and there it was found a most pitiful wage was being paid the girls, those who make the chocolates, who mold it with the hands; and, by the way, we found that the Italian girls were the best makers of confectionery. The wage in the candy factories was not much over \$4.50, and we have raised the wages there to such an extent that the girls are paid a living wage of about \$8 to \$9.

We have taken hold of the department stores, too. Before our commission went to work the firm of Filene & Co., of Boston, paid a living wage, I am thankful to say. There are employers who are humanitarians, and, of course, there are others who are not. Human nature is the same the world over, but I am happy to state that the conditions found in the department store of William Filene & Co.

were excellent, and they were a splendid model for the others to copy after.

Therefore I am in hearty sympathy, especially with this District bill, because I believe conditions here make it almost impossible for young girls to exist without the passage of such a bill as Mr. Keating has introduced here. The living conditions here are doubtless from 15 per cent to 30 per cent higher as to cost of living than they are in Boston and other cities in Massachusetts.

What I would like to see more than anything else would be a national minimum wage commission. There are in this country to-day minimum wage commissions, I believe, in Kentucky, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New York, and I will be pleased to have this bill pass the House and Senate and be signed by the President so as to ameliorate the conditions of so many girls who are coming here to take up work in the department stores. But what is good for Massachusetts and the District of Columbia and New York and Wisconsin, which already have the minimum wage commission, is good for the whole country, and I would like to see a national minimum wage commission established. [Applause.]

Mrs. KELLEY. I shall call next another speaker from Massachusetts, Mr. Arthur N. Holcombe, who has been chairman of the Massachusetts Minimum Wage Commission, and is now a member of the United States Bureau of Efficiency.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR N. HOLCOMBE, OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. HOLCOMBE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Mr. Frankfurter in speaking to you has shown you that Congress has the power to pass this bill provided the conditions in Washington appear to demand a remedy, and the Commissioner of Labor Statistics submitted here the evidence collected by his bureau showing you that there is a need for relief.

Now, the question that remains to be considered is this: Does the minimum wage offer reasonable promise of relief here in the District? I want to tell you briefly of the results of the minimum wage in the State of Massachusetts. I believe that the experience of Massachusetts is particularly significant. It was the first State in which the minimum wage was adopted. It is the State in which the largest number of wage-earning women are employed of all the States in which the minimum wage has been tried in this country, and it is the State in which conditions, I believe, are nearest like those here in the Federal District.

I have been a member of the commission since it was first established six years ago. I have had the privilege of participating in the administration of the law, and I call to your attention without any argument what has actually happened in our State.

At the time we first began work there were about 200,000 wage-earning women in the State of Massachusetts, excluding those employed in retail stores, laundries, shops with less than \$5,000 output per annum, and excluding those under the age of 18. The total number of wage-earning women no one knew. As directed by law we investigated the earnings of women in various employments, and wherever we found a substantial number of women earning a sum

insufficient to cover the cost of living and to maintain the worker in health, we were directed by the act to establish for that occupation a minimum-wage board. That board consisted of equal numbers of persons, chosen by the employees and the employers, respectively, to represent their several interests, and a limited number of impartial persons to represent the public. The board consequently could come to no conclusion without careful consideration of the conditions in the industry and of the sentiments of those closest to the industry. On reaching a conclusion it was empowered by the act to submit recommendations to the commission. After a public hearing on those recommendations the commission was empowered to put the recommended rates into effect.

In the five years that have since elapsed the commission has established wage boards in the industries of brush making, corset making, candy making, laundries, retail stores, in paper boxes, women's clothing (cloaks, suits, shirts, dresses, and waists), men's clothing and raincoats and outer garments, men's furnishings (practically everything from collar buttons to shoe strings), women's muslins and white goods; and in the manufacture of millinery, and also to deal with office women and charwomen and similar classes of workers.

The first board to make a recommendation to our commission was established in the brush industry. At that time it paid the lowest wages of the continuously operating industries of the Commonwealth. One year after the recommendations of the commission had been in operation we made a careful investigation to ascertain precisely what had been the effect of the minimum wage.

You will have gathered from Congressman Olney's remarks that on the establishment of the minimum-wage commission in Massachusetts there was considerable opposition to that commission. We had to overcome the fears of the timid and of the complacent and of the vicious; and we were extremely anxious that there should be wide public acquaintance with actual results of the minimum wage in that first industry.

We found, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that the establishment of the minimum wage in the brush industry had been followed by a remarkable increase not only in the wages but in the actual earnings of the women. Secondly, we found that the employment of women at ruinously low rates of pay had been stopped. Thirdly, that the proportion of women employed at more than the prescribed minimum pay had doubled. So that the old objection that the minimum wage comes to be the maximum wage was shown to be without foundation. Finally, that all this had been accomplished—and this is what I want to call particularly to your attention, because I know that you are interested in the effect of the minimum wage upon business—all this had been accomplished without putting an unreasonable financial burden upon the industry.

What was the evidence upon which we made that last finding? It was this: During the two years covered by our investigations, during most of which the minimum rates had been in operation, the total number of brush establishments in Massachusetts had increased, the total capital invested in the industry had increased, the total value of the material used in the industry had increased, and the total

value of the product had increased. In the face of those findings, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we felt ourselves justified in informing the public that the establishment of the minimum wage had been followed by the desired results and without any excessive burden being placed upon the industry.

With your permission I will file with you for the further information of the members of the committee, if they desire, this report, in which are set forth in full all of the information upon which those findings are based. This is entitled, "Bulletin No. 7, Publications of the Minimum Wage Commission of Massachusetts, Results of the Minimum Wage in the Brush Industry."

The second industry in which the recommended minimum wages went into operation was the retail-store industry. Again, a year after the rates had been in operation, the commission made a careful investigation, examining the pay rolls, studying the records of business failures, covering all information available upon which an opinion could be based. And again, with your permission, I will quote briefly from the findings of the commission. We found that at least 25 per cent of the total number of female employees of retail stores had received increases of pay which they clearly would not have received but for the minimum wage law.

Mr. HILLIARD. What page are you reading from?

Mr. HOLCOMBE. I am reading from page 17 of the fourth annual report of the Minimum Wage Commission of Massachusetts for the year ending December 31, 1916. We found that "many others whose wages were increased during the period covered by the investigation doubtless had received greater increases than they would normally have received. These increases ranged all the way from 50 cents to \$4.50 a week." Think of it, an employer raising the wages of a girl from \$4 a week to \$8.50 a week to comply with our recommendation, rather than to let that girl go from his employ. Think how he had been underpaying that girl before that increase was made. (Reading:)

"These increases ranged all the way from 50 cents to \$4.50 a week, and altogether caused an addition to the weekly pay roll for women and girls employed in retail stores amounting to more than \$6,000 in the 208 establishments from which this information was obtained."

I will now call to your attention certain other results of the minimum wages which are perhaps more significant than further details on that point:

In general it may be said that most experienced women now employed in retail stores are receiving not less than the minimum rates recommended by the commission; that most learners and apprentices are now employed under more favorable conditions and with better prospects than ever before; and that no such general increase in wages as has actually occurred would have taken place but for the operation of the minimum-wage law. These good results have apparently been accomplished without imposing any undue financial burden upon the retail stores. The acceptance of the minimum wage required a general readjustment of rates in many stores, and in some of these the process of readjustment entailed a change of occupation on the part of a relatively small number of women. In most cases, however, where it was possible to identify and trace these women it was found that they were better off financially as a result of their change of occupation. The acceptance of the minimum wage has not caused the reduction of the wages of the better-paid employees. In other words, there is no tendency for the minimum to become the maximum. On the contrary, a larger proportion of the women employed in retail stores where the commission's recommendations have been followed are now paid at rates above the minimum than before.

With your permission I will leave with you a report of the minimum-wage commission, in which there is set forth in full the findings of fact upon which those conclusions are based. (Bulletin No. 12, Preliminary Report on the Results of the Minimum Wage in Retail Stores in Massachusetts.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not the time at my disposal to deal fully with all the objections which may be brought against the minimum wage. In fact, I am inclined to believe that it is not necessary at this time to deal with those objections. I have had the privilege and the pleasure within the last few days of talking with a number of the proprietors of retail stores in this city, and I take this opportunity to say that I have the highest respect for the good will and the intelligent interest displayed by these men. I believe that the retail-store proprietors in the District of Columbia, now that this matter has been brought to their attention, are, as was said this morning, prepared to take an attitude here which reflects great credit not only upon themselves but upon the sentiment of the people in this community, the National Capital.

I can not take up in detail all the objections to the minimum wage, and it is not necessary; but this one significant fact should be mentioned: After establishing the minimum wage in the retail stores, and after it had been in operation there for a year, we established wage boards in several industries which come into close contact with the retail stores, namely, in the industries manufacturing women's clothing and men's clothing. Now, those are industries in which the employers sell their product to the stores. They were in the best possible position to form an opinion as to how the minimum wage was operating in the stores. Sufficient time had elapsed for that opinion to be formed. When we asked them if they would join with the representatives of their employees in forming a wage board to consider whether the minimum wage should be established in their industry as it had been established in retail stores, they accepted that invitation; they nominated their representatives to serve on the boards, and they agreed unanimously in making recommendations for a minimum wage to the minimum-wage commission.

I do not think any evidence could be more conclusive than that of the sentiments of those business men. They were in the best possible condition to know what the results of the minimum wage had been, and knowing what they must have known, the fact that they were prepared to go forward and introduce the legal minimum wage in their industries to my mind speaks more eloquently than volumes of statistics.

In conclusion, there are two general inferences which I have drawn from my six years' experience with the minimum wage in Massachusetts. First, and it is a positive conclusion, that, in general, high wages mean low labor costs. In comparing the pay rolls of competing establishments (and we were never able to make this information public in the most convincing way because we never felt free to make public actual conditions in individual firms) we found when comparing the pay rolls of different establishments competing in the same industry, selling in the same market, drawing their labor from the same sources, that as a general rule in those establishments where higher wages were paid for the same class of labor, the labor costs

were lower, measured as a percentage of the goods sold. In other words, high wages and low labor costs tend to go together.

Secondly, and this follows in a way from the first—

Mr. MASON. You mean that the high wages produced more business?

Mr. HOLCOMBE. Yes; and at a less cost. Employers who paid the highest wages were paying the lowest number of cents to their employees for each dollar's worth of goods sold.

Mr. MASON. On a percentage basis.

Mr. HOLCOMBE. Secondly, we found that low wages were not always caused by low efficiency on the part of the wage earner. You frequently hear it said, "We can not afford to pay a girl more than she is worth," and there is something in that. Then further you hear it said that what she is worth is indicated by what she is now receiving. There is often very little in that statement. The fact that a girl is receiving a low wage does not demonstrate that her worth is low. On the contrary, one of the factors upon which the efficiency of the girl, and hence the worth of the girl in that particular establishment depends, is the efficiency of the management. In other words, low wages may not indicate low worth on the part of the wage earner, but they may indicate low managerial ability on the part of the employer.

Those two conclusions furnish the key to the solution of many of the arguments brought against the minimum wage.

Now, finally, I want to say that without hesitation and without qualification I indorse the Keating bill. It differs from the Massachusetts law in certain respects. I am not arguing that the Massachusetts experience shows that the Massachusetts law is the best law, but that it shows the principle of the minimum wage to be a wise measure of social progress. The Massachusetts law in my judgment is inferior to the proposed Keating bill in at least one important respect, and that is with respect to the manner of enforcement. Under the Keating bill there is a penalty provided in the act itself for the employer who violates the established rate, and in my judgment that is the way in which the law should be enforced. The Government, which lays down a social policy, should take the responsibility for enforcing that policy by such penalties as may be necessary and proper.

In Massachusetts, as Congressman Olney very properly said, we had to encounter in the beginning timidity and complacency and viciousness. There was no experience in this country to guide us, and in order to overcome the initial opposition we adopted a law which did not provide that mode of enforcement. It provided simply for making public the names of those who accepted and those who did not accept our recommendations. Despite that method of enforcement, results have been accomplished, and I merely mention that feature of our law in order that you may not draw from the Massachusetts evidence the conclusion which you ought not to draw, namely, that the law itself is the best possible law.

The two objections to that method of enforcement are these: First, the extent of the penalty is uncertain. If you blacklist an employer for not paying the minimum wage you do not know how

much damage you are going to do him; and, secondly, this method of enforcement will bear unequally upon different employers, depending upon the directness of their contact with the public, particularly that portion of the public which would respond to the blacklisting of a recalcitrant employer. These objections, it seems to me, are serious and, quite apart from the efficacy of the mode of enforcement, condemn the method.

Therefore, gentlemen, I wish simply to repeat in concluding: You have the power to pass this law. Conditions in the District require action. Massachusetts's experience shows that the minimum wage is a remedy affording a reasonable promise of relief. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mrs. KELLEY. If I may, I will call for evidence from Mrs. Newton D. Baker, who is on the executive committee of the Consumers' League of the District of Columbia, and who is acquainted with conditions here.

STATEMENT OF MRS. NEWTON D. BAKER.

Mrs. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I have here the evidence of the room-registration office of the Council of National Defense, which is finding rooms for women in Washington at the rate of 120 to 150 a day. The largest number that have been placed in one day was 275. These figures condensed show that the minimum expense at which a woman can find a room and board here is \$35 a month. That means two in a room, and there are very few rooms that can be had at that rate. Most of them are very much higher than that, and apparently they are going up in price.

The study of the cost of living made by the Department of Labor last year showed that of 600 women 46 per cent were not making living wages.

I know very little personally about the living conditions of the women who are working in Washington, but I became very familiar with them in Cleveland. The consumers' league in Cleveland made a survey of the cost of living and they found that a woman could not live in decent conditions under \$7.20 a week. That was several years ago, and, of course, it is more now. This estimate allowed for no illnesses and no loss of time or anything of that sort. We tried to get from the employers of Cleveland a minimum wage of \$8 a week. We did not succeed; we were not able to persuade the employers of Cleveland that with the minimum cost of living \$7.20, it was their duty to give at least \$8.

I went with many other women to see boarding places available to women who, under our figures, needed \$7.20 a week for their living expenses, and I assure you that if you could have seen the places that were the only ones available to women not living at home, you would realize the vital necessity for this sort of legislation. [Applause.]

Mrs. KELLEY. Mr. Filene, of the Filene Store, in Boston, and a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Filene began to pay minimum wages long before there was a minimum wage law in this country. He is here to-day to give evidence as to the desirability of this legislation.

STATEMENT OF MR. EDWARD A. FILENE, OF THE WILLIAM FILENE SONS' CO., OF BOSTON, NOW DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE SHIPPING COMMITTEE.

MR. FILENE. Mr. Chairman, I take it that if I can be of any service to this committee it would lie largely in telling from the practical storekeeper's standpoint what my experience is with the minimum wage. I want, with your permission, to preface that with my strong conviction that what Mr. Frankfurter said in ending his convincing argument that this is peculiarly a war measure is true. I think that otherwise I should not have been here. And let me say that I believe that is so especially now that a hearing like this is actually on.

I am trying to help, with a lot of other men, to get out ships. We know the need of ships is very critical; we know that we are sending our boys who are staking their lives in the faith that the American people will supply the ships to keep them supplied with food, etc. This is the greatest adventure of history that we are undertaking. It seems hardly believable under those circumstances that there should be only about half operation in the shipyards. I said in Chicago last week before a large gathering that the fault was not in the Government, but in the community, in the average citizen of the country; and it is not because we are vicious or indifferent, but because we do not understand.

Making the world safe for democracy is a big-sounding thing, and it appears as if freedom were an eagle in the air that never has to do anything; that does not have to get anything to eat, but just flaps its wings. If the community is to support shipbuilding, and without it we can not get out the ships, then the community has got to visualize something concrete out of making the world safe for democracy. That freedom has got to mean something to the average man or woman, and freedom does not consist in speeches; there is no freedom without a material base and support to it. You can not teach spiritual truth to starving people.

When we make this appeal throughout the community, when we make the appeal in the shipbuilding communities for loyal support in such a way as to make the man in the shipyard feel that he is an industrial soldier and doing as much as the man with the gun, then the community which is being oppressed, being badly used, will not respond to that appeal, and the result is bad. It becomes peculiarly true that if now when the minimum-wage issue is put up this committee should say, and Congress should say—and I do not believe you will say it—but I want you to imagine what the effect would be if Congress should say that these unjust wages—because they are unjust—are sufficient, or that for any other reason they do not see fit to deal with it. Prof. Holcombe made a statement that appealed to me very much, and that is as to the relation of underpaid help to the "bosses." A \$5 a week employee does make a cheap boss.

I have been rather surprised that so little has been said to you of our case. We employers need this legislation really, not figuratively; we need this legislation just as much as the employees do. Cheap wages make cheap standards, and the danger is that with all the details of the supervision necessary with cheap wages we will be

satisfied with those cheap standards. Our business, the retail distribution, is about the most lawless business in the world, I think. I am constantly afraid that I shall die disgraced. That is true. It is all well enough to have some of these ladies say that Filene's put in the minimum wage first. That was a smart thing to do, you know. I sometimes wonder how many kinds of a hypocrite I am. [Laughter.] Every decent thing one does in business pays, but it is really true that we have never done a decent thing in business which has not finally paid. It comes unexpectedly most of the time, but it does come. We employers, dealing with a cheap underpaid lot of employees, have got to use most of our time in adjusting the differences and disaffections that arise through that. We are dealing in a business where the average thing doubles in price from the producer to the consumer, and this is disgraceful. That is the disgrace I had in mind; the average thing we handle doubles in price. Of course when that is really understood it is going to be remedied; and if we in the retail distribution business do not remedy it, we will be eliminated, and the distribution will come from the producer direct to the consumer with the aid of the parcel post or something of that kind.

Now, the reason that we have not dealt better with it before I think is largely because we have not had intelligent enough employees. I think it will appeal to you gentlemen as business men that an underpaid employee will not have strength or desire to study very much to put more intelligence into the distribution, into the selling. You say, of course, that the management ought to furnish the intelligence; they are paid a lot of money to do so. But, as a rule, we do not; we are hard pressed with small details of competition, and we usually go ahead as fast as we are pushed ahead; and the greatest incentive, the greatest power, the underlying power for improvement within the business, lies in correcting the weaknesses of our employees, and in intelligent study by the employees. The \$7 a week girl is pretty hard pressed with her own problems, and she does not have very much time to do much more than just do her day's work and then worry for the rest of the time about how she is going to get along with what she has made that day. That is not good for the employer. A decent wage is based on intelligent work, which means intelligent management in the final analysis. Most of us business men see this. A minority of short-sighted men force the others to do really what they do not approve of; and after all, this minimum wage legislation merely provides the machinery. That is one of the real reasons for approving it—the minimum wage legislation merely provides the machinery by which joint action is secured by that part of the industry that really is far-sighted enough to advance it. That makes the slacker employer in the shops, in the industry, who does not want to think hard enough to see what is really the profitable thing in business stop and think; it really takes the blinders off of him by making him give wages good enough so that he will have some time to think of these problems.

I will pass now to the actual experience that we had with the minimum wage. I was under the impression that we had it a good deal longer than I find we have when I look it up. But we have had the minimum wage in our concern since March 1, 1912, and the important thing about it is that relatively the cost of the wages as compared

with other costs of running the business has not increased, but, on the contrary, has decreased. Is that clear? That, relative to the other costs, the cost of running the store we have not found to increase on account of a minimum wage. We have found that there was an enormous advantage in adopting the minimum wage.

Mr. HILLIARD. Although the employees have received higher wages?

Mr. FILENE. Oh, yes; very much. We pay a bonus for what is sold above what the minimum wage calls for. We encourage all we can the increase of wages through bonuses which come from a percentage, which is half the percentage that the minimum wage represents. The best proof that this experiment in these six or seven years has been very satisfactory is shown by the fact that on April 1 of this year we made a new minimum wage of \$9 for inexperienced help and \$10 after one year, and then an increase of 50 cents a week each six months until \$12 is reached. We would not be satisfied even with a \$12 wage, unless our sales people could earn more than that; we would not grow as fast as our ambitions want us to grow. It is not a question of philanthropy; it is a question of good business. The more intelligent a girl can become and the more she can sell, the less the overhead expenses weigh upon the business, upon the individual sales.

We must put into stores the Ford production idea—to handle such large quantities that the overhead charges become negligible—and that has got to be applied to retail distribution, because, as I have said, the charge that retail distribution puts upon production is disgraceful.

Now, of course, this may sound a little bit up in the air, that we had rather pay more than \$12, but all of these things have produced results. I am going to boast somewhat and say that in this kind of work we have grown to be by far the biggest thing in the world of the kind; we are doing a business of over \$14,000,000, and we are doing it at the present time with the greater part of our management in war work, away from the business an important part of the time. The employees have grown distinctly in thinking capacity during the attempt. It fails very often, but still the definite attempt to deal intelligently—and to deal intelligently means an attempt at justice—has succeeded.

It, perhaps, might pay just for a minute before I close to show you the statement that went out to our employees on April 1. Our people are convinced that the new \$10 minimum wage will not increase the percentage of the cost of wages to the total expenses of the store, and I am personally convinced that that is true. There is so much leeway in the improvement in retail distribution and in production that the extra initial cost can be made to pay. The statement said:

The minimum wage for experienced help is now \$10; for inexperienced help, \$9. Anyone who has been in the store six months or who has had six months of experience elsewhere is to receive at least \$9.50.

Beginning to-day there is to be an advance of at least 50 cents for each half year of service as completed for all employees earning less than \$12, provided their work is considered to be satisfactory. For those who have been in this store less than a year these increases will come on the semianniversary of their entrance. All who have been here more than a year and who are earning

less than \$12 have received a flat increase of \$1. Their semiannual increases of 50 cents, therefore, will come on October 1 and April 1.

The store manager is to arrange for a separate consideration and determination of the facts in every case where the employee is not approved for the standard semiannual increase by the department executive.

I will stop there because that brings up the thought as to what becomes of the people who can not earn \$12. Most of them can earn it. There are very few who can not earn \$12; and if they know they ought to learn, they go to evening classes and read about this, or find out about that, in order to earn \$12.

Mr. HILLIARD. The very encouragement of this increased wage would help them?

Mr. FILENE. Oh, yes; it tones them up. There is nothing so costly as cheap help. I personally have always, in picking my executives, preferred very expensive executives. If I have a man or woman working for me in an important office for \$2,000, I will keep them if they make mistakes, because it does not cost much; but if that position is filled by somebody who is paid \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000—and we are paying \$25,000 salaries in a store like ours, quite a number of them—then I am bound to help them improve their work, or else find somebody who can do it, because I can not afford these important losses that the higher wages impose upon me. If a man or woman is working for me for \$15 or \$20 a week, or a girl for \$5 or \$6 a week, I am complacent and let them go on, thinking that, after all, they do not cost very much; but that is the most costly thing that can happen to my business. It is not what they are getting a week, but what they ought to deliver and could deliver if conditions were made right for them.

If you are in doubt about the situation, I think you will find in stores over the country where the minimum wage is placed pretty high, higher than was contemplated in Massachusetts—you will find the owners are content. In Detroit Hudson & Co., the biggest store in Detroit, pay \$12 as a minimum wage, and the owners are very well satisfied and see that it does really pay to do that.

I am not going to deal with the theory that no trade or occupation is justifiable which does not pay a decent wage. I think you have accepted that. The only thing that would take the place of this sort of a minimum wage, and which might properly take the place of it, would be to make the employers pay as much attention to their employees and be as responsible to them as they are to their cows and horses. We treat our cows and horses well because we have got to pay out the money directly if we maltreat them and they become sick or die. If we were directly responsible for our employees, there would not be any need for the minimum-wage proposition; but because we can drop an employee who becomes sick from lack of proper wages, because society takes up that burden for us, we blindly go ahead—shortsightedly go ahead—and let this system keep on. It ought not to go on, and especially it ought not to go on now. It has in it the poisoning of the very strength we need in this critical time if we are really going to win this war. [Applause.]

Mr. HILLIARD. We will now take a recess until 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 12.50 o'clock p. m., the committee took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.)

AFTER RECESS.

The committee met, pursuant to the taking of recess, at 2 o'clock p. m.

Mr. HILLIARD. I think we will go on now, and in the absence of Mrs. Kelley Miss Goldmark will introduce the speakers.

Miss GOLDMARK. I should like to introduce Dr. W. C. Woodward, health commissioner of the District of Columbia.

**STATEMENT OF DR. W. C. WOODWARD, HEALTH COMMISSIONER
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

Mr. WOODWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel very much like apologizing for my presence here to-day. I presume I have been invited to speak merely for the purpose of getting into the record the fact that the health interests of the District and, I believe, the health interests of the Nation are concerned in the matter of the legislation intended to establish minimum wages for women and for children. The facts that I have to present are so patent, so well known, that it would seem like a waste of time if my appearance were for any other purpose.

That there is a very definite relation between wages and health, and between wages and morals, I think will be conceded by every one who at any time has had to earn his own living, and who has even the slightest knowledge of hygiene or health. We know that in any organized community we can not get ordinary shelter without paying for it; that to clothe the body costs money; that food costs money; that provision for ordinary protection against illness requires money; and that protection of life—if you will, provision for recreational facilities—requires the expenditure of money; and we know that the wage earner depends on her wage to get that money. It stands to reason, therefore, that inadequacy of wage means either of two things: On the one hand it may mean inadequacy of shelter, inadequacy of clothing, inadequacy of food, inadequacy of recreational facilities on the one hand it may mean any one of those conditions, or it may mean all—with resultant impoverishment of health—or, on the other hand, it means that from some source or other the wage must be supplemented, with possible resort to wrongdoing to accomplish that end. I am very loathe, however, to connect up minimum wages with moral questions. The most I care to say there is that when one is tempted the lack of physical stamina and the necessity for maintaining life increase the weight of the inducement certainly make yielding easier.

From the postulate that adequate wages are necessary for the protection of health, we come to the question as to why working women particularly need the assistance of the proposed legislation. I am not going to undertake any analysis of the situation, such as was presented this morning, with respect to the ability of women to protect themselves in the matter of legislation and wage control, but I would like to point out a few essential facts. One is that so many of the girls who are compelled to go out to earn their living must go at a period of adolescence, at a time when it is essential that they be well nourished and not undernourished. It is essential for the

full development of young girls that their life be not too narrowed by hardship. There is something more than bread and butter and clothing and a roof over our heads, and adequate development calls for it. A girl who is lacking in any of these particulars is not a girl who is going to develop into the best woman, to serve the State; she is not the girl who is going to have, we will say, the best possible instincts toward matrimony, and she is not the girl who will have the greatest possible insistence on the wisest choice of a husband. Those things ought to be considered, because after all it is in marriage and the bearing of offspring that the race relies for its continuance in a proper form. So even without reference to a woman's own condition, and the maintenance of her own physical, mental, and emotional health, we must bear in mind the fact that when she marries and when she bears and rears children for the coming generation, if she has been properly trained and has adequate opportunities to care for herself we shall be able to maintain the integrity of the race, we shall be able as a Nation to meet the perils that confront us in the future as we are meeting the perils that confront us at the present time; and otherwise we shall fail. We have heard a great deal to-day with respect to the need of the individual woman; but we must go beyond that need and must face the fact that we are acting for the race, we are acting for the Nation, and the Nation needs all these women to be kept in the best possible condition.

Nothing has been said here yet with respect to the clause in the bill regarding the regulation of the wages to be paid children. I want to say a word in approval of that. Anything that tends to protect the children is certainly something that will protect the race. To protect the children, who we know can not protect themselves, who have been aptly described here to-day as the wards of the Nation, is certainly an essential duty.

One other remark and then I will be through. I dislike the habit of thought that we have that undertakes to measure life simply in duration, in terms of years. I believe there is something more to life than that, and that we can not from our vital statistics show all of the results that we hope to attain from legislation of this kind. There is something more than bare efficiency, the bare productivity of the individual as a factor in the community. Our life has not only length, but it has breadth and depth and it has a current, and legislation that is going to protect that life not only with respect to duration, not only with respect to productive efficiency—the bare matter of dollars and cents—but legislation that will protect the fullness of life is, it seems to me, as much justified as legislation that is intended simply to see that life is drawn out, it may be, into a useless old age, or that it is narrowed down into a channel from which the State or the community can hope to derive the largest possible return in dollars and cents. So I should plead for legislation that would protect the growing girl, that would protect the child, and that would assure to each and every one of them the best opportunity to develop into the most useful and into the happiest possible member of the body politic. [Applause.]

Mrs. KELLEY. I wish to call upon Father Ryan, of the Catholic University, who is the author of our most authoritative book in this country on the living wage. It was he who really started the agitation in this country.

STATEMENT OF REV. DR. JOHN A. RYAN, OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

Dr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, before saying the few things that I have to say with regard to the question before you, I would like to say I am sorry that my friend Frankfurter is no longer here, because he made a bit of an excursion into Biblical exegesis when he stated that the phrase, "the poor you have always with you," was not really in the Gospel, or something to that effect. Of course we can not admit that it is not in the Gospel, but I want to insist very strongly that the application of it to future generations and to all generations and to all time, has no plausible basis in the text itself. Christ said, "the poor you have always with you; me you have not always." Therefore plainly he was speaking to the people before him and to the Apostles, and was not speaking to the succeeding generations, as we are told by the people who like to make a justification of poverty and the hard conditions that are connected with poverty and poor wages. When I hear that Biblical phrase used to justify a general condition of poverty, or any special condition of poverty, I am reminded of the saying that we are acquainted with, I think sufficiently, that the devil can quote scripture for his purposes.

Now, I have been asked to say something of the effect of low wages on health, but I do not think that I should take up your time by dwelling on that in any detail. As Dr. Woodward has said, that particular effect of low wages is so obvious and patent that it ought not to be necessary to speak of it at length. But by way of summary and in order to indicate perhaps concrete sources from which that can be shown, because it is necessary sometimes, as obvious things are neglected because they are so obvious, I just want to give the references to the pages in the formidable-looking volumes before you which contain a rather varied amount of evidence upon this matter. In part 2, pages 77 to 99, there are presented testimonies from many different sources: for example, the New York State Department of Health, the United States Public Health Service, the Report of the New York State Factory Investigation Commission, and the Industrial Commission of Ohio. Here is United States Senate Document No. 645, Report on the Condition of Women and Child Wages in the United States, and the Report of the Social Survey of the Consumers League of Oregon on the hours, wages, and conditions of work, and several private studies, such as volumes by particular individuals of authority. There is a great deal of this matter that is quite concrete and that furnishes, I think, the element of conviction that may be missing in what is merely patent and obvious. It gives us definite details as to the particular persons and particular groups of persons with reference to the effect which low wages have upon health.

There are just two points that I think I may address myself to briefly, the first of which is the verdict of experience in favor of minimum wage legislation, and the second is the actual possibility of determining this thing that we call a decent wage.

As to the first point, the verdict of experience, a great deal has been recounted already to-day by Prof. Holcombe, who went into

that in relation to his experience in Massachusetts. I think the experience of Oregon is even more significant than that of Massachusetts. In Oregon the law was put into operation on a much wider scale than in Massachusetts. Within a year they had the law in operation in practically all the industries of the State. That year was 1913 and a part of 1914, a period when the industrial depression prevailing on the Pacific coast was much greater than anything we knew here in the East. The law was put into effect under perhaps the most unfavorable conditions in which it could have been put into operation. Yet the agents of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, after investigation of the stores of Portland and Salem, found that not one of the usual arguments against the minimum-wage legislation had been verified. For example, one of the stock arguments is that the minimum wage tends to become a maximum, that in order to offset the added cost from lifting the wages of the poorer paid the employer lowers the wages of the better paid. Of course the obvious answer to that would be that if that is such an easy device, why did not the employer think of it before and lower the wages of those higher ones if it was such an easy thing to do when he found such a particular exigency arising to induce him to do it? As a matter of fact, the investigators found that those workers who had been getting more than the minimum wage fixed by the law, which was \$9.25 a week in the stores, at the end of a year after the law had been put into operation had not had their wages decreased, and, in fact, the proportion getting more than the minimum was greater after the law was in effect than it was a year before that time. They also found that in spite of the scarcity of employment, in spite of the general industrial depression there had been no unemployment to amount to anything caused by the law. The same has been the story in every place without exception in which this legislation has been tried. The stock arguments have been falsified; the dire effects of it predicted beforehand have not occurred. That is true everywhere in the States in this country where it is in operation, and it has been proved abundantly true of Great Britain and Australia, where they have had much longer experience.

Perhaps the best proof entering into the general argument from experience is the fact that no State anywhere in the world that has adopted this legislation is thinking of changing it, and there is not any considerable body of opinion anywhere asking for a repeal of this legislation. On the contrary, wherever it is in partial operation the tendency is, as some one mentioned this morning in regard to England, for the further extension of the law.

As to the other point, that it is really possible to determine what we mean when talking of a decent wage, I mention that because a great many persons are under the impression that when we are discussing decent wages as against low wages we are talking about something that can not be based on concrete facts; that we are getting into a subject where the cost of living of various persons varies so much that the individual factor is the important one, and they say that if many of the workers would try as hard as some particular ones we know, everyone could do just as well as the particular ones who are now making both ends meet. The fallacy of that statement is that it assumes that the majority of persons can do what a few

exceptional persons can do. We all know girls who can live decently on \$7 a week, but they are exceptional and extraordinary persons; they use extraordinary devices to make a wage do what perhaps a wage of \$2 more would be necessary to enable the average person to live on. In other words, we can not judge the average person of the majority by the exceptions. The experience of every group of persons who have gone into this question of the cost of living, the minimum decent cost of living of working girls throughout this country, in a dozen or more cities, has pointed to the conclusion that, considering the complexity of the situation, it is surprisingly definite, and that experience showed that before 1914 a decent wage for the female worker could not be less than \$9 a week; that it was probably somewhere between \$9 and \$10 a week. I submit that that is a somewhat definite result in the face of the complex situation we have to deal with, to be arrived at by groups in different parts of the country.

So it is quite possible to determine what we mean by decent living wages; and when this bill becomes a law, as we hope it will, it will be quite possible and, in fact, relatively simple for the commission that has the matter in charge to determine what the cost of decent living for a working girls is in the District of Columbia. The thing has been done so often elsewhere that the task will be comparatively simple here.

Just a word with regard to my own experience in that connection. In 1914 in Minnesota I was a member of one of the advisory boards which had the task of determining the decent minimum wage for females working in mercantile establishments of the Twin Cities, and I was also chairman of a subcommittee that had charge of the particular item of board and lodging. All of the members of the committee who were employers gave us all that "old stuff," to use a bit of parlance of the day, about the impossibility of determining what was the proper cost of living; that there was so much difference in different girls, etc.; but when we got down to the actual investigation and brought in facts as to the number of places in the two cities where a girl could board and how much she would have to pay in the different classes of boarding houses, and how much she would have to pay in the different classes of restaurants, eating places, they had to admit that, after all, we were dealing with something rather definite, and they had to agree, for example, to the proposition that \$4.85 a week was the smallest sum that could be allowed for board and lodging in 1914 in the Twin Cities. In the same way the members of the subcommittee that had to do with clothing, and the other one that had to do with incidental expenses—all the other expenses except clothing and board and lodging—after some investigation and discussion, found that it was possible to state the lowest sum that any decent person would want to admit that a girl should be compelled to live on in the Twin Cities; and so these three subcommittees all agreed as to the three separate estimates.

A curious thing then happened. When we had a meeting of the general committee to determine what would be the total cost of living allowed for all the various items, we began to submit the report of the subcommittee on board and lodging, which had agreed on \$4.85 a week as the sum for that item, and the whole committee accepted that. Immediately the employer members of the board saw

that this thing was becoming a simple problem in addition, and that if we took up all the other items and the whole committee adopted them as the subcommittees, including the employer members, had already adopted them, the addition would come to about \$9 a week. So they immediately made a motion that without considering further the reports of the subcommittees the wage should be fixed at \$7.50 a week. That was voted down, however. I mention this to show that when we get back to the concrete issues and circumstances we can determine what we mean pretty definitely by a living wage.

Mr. HILLIARD. In other words, Doctor, I take it that these employers, rather than have the facts revealed in the light of day, preferred to raise the wages?

Dr. RYAN. Exactly, but they did not want to raise them as far as the commission did. I want to say in this connection that the attitude of the employers on that particular board in Minnesota was quite different from the action of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association here, as I have learned to-day. I believe the difference is simply a difference in experience, in finding out what the results of this legislation have been, and a difference in the education perhaps of the employers with regard not only to the justice of this claim but the profitableness of it from the viewpoint of the employer, as set forth by Mr. Filene this morning.

I think there is nothing else I have to contribute that is worth while. Several years ago one of my friends, who is not reactionary at all, but who did not believe in this minimum-wage proposition, said to me, "You are too intolerant on this matter. You ought to see the other side." I replied, "There is no other side," and the more experience we get as to the situation the more I am convinced that it is the absolute truth. I have strong political notions, but I admit the other fellow has something on his side; and I have strong notions in other departments of thought, but I admit that other people have something on their side; but, so far as I can see, there is no single fact, or principle, or truth, or argument against the principle of minimum-wage legislation. (Applause.)

Mr. HILLIARD. This legislation, of course, will be local in its application, and the circumstances you have referred to have been local, of course. But in addition, it would be helpful in the circumstances, I take it, from your view—and it must be so—and would contribute to the general level of education in relation to the whole matter?

Dr. RYAN. Exactly.

Mr. HILLIARD. And that probably accounts somewhat for difference in the attitude of the merchants that we have heard about this morning from what it was at the time referred to in your argument, when it was not so well known?

Dr. RYAN. Yes; and I think that is a very important point. That is one of the by-products and a very important by-product of the legislation. One might go into the matter further and point out other by-products of the same general kind, as tending to educate the employers and employees in their relation to one another in the direction of a better understanding.

Mr. HILLIARD. It occurred to me that you might be able to amplify that, and I would like to hear you further.

Dr. RYAN. I do not know that I could elaborate it offhand. There has been a remarkable amount of difference throughout the country in these wage boards and advisory boards that have been dealing with legislation of this kind, as regards the attitude of the employers. As I have said, the attitude of this Minnesota group was very hostile, very intolerant, and largely an attitude of resentment that such a thing should have been "put over" on them, because the law did get through the legislature before any of them knew what was going on.

In other States, in Oregon and in Washington also, the attitude of the employers was much more friendly, and in Massachusetts, according to the testimony given here this morning, the attitude of a good many of the employers was not so bad. I think the difference has been due largely to differences of education of the employers. When the employer comes to find that legislation of this sort, which has been regarded by him as merely class legislation altogether directed against his interests, is not such a bad thing, perhaps the general effect will be to educate him to realize that the results are different from what he thought they were, and he will begin to be more sceptical about the views he has held heretofore as to the absolute irreconcilability of the interests of capital and labor on certain important points. We know that the interests of capital and labor are not altogether identical, and it is folly and deception to assert that they are; but they are identical within certain broad lines and within certain very important lines. The average employer, I think, and perhaps the average employee, does not realize how big that field is in which their interests are identical, and anything that will contribute to educate either of them, or both of them, to find out how much they have really in common will be a very valuable thing, aside from its immediate effects.

Mr. MASON. Your view is this, that while there are some questions on which there are two sides, this bill, known as the Keating bill, really protects both sides, so that as a matter of fact the employee and the employer are both protected by this plan?

Dr. RYAN. Yes, sir.

Mrs. KELLY. Miss Julia O'Connor, another witness from Massachusetts, who represents the Women's Trade-Union League, and has served on several boards in administering the Massachusetts law, will now address you.

STATEMENT OF MISS JULIA O'CONNOR, PRESIDENT MASSACHUSETTS TELEPHONE OPERATORS' UNION, MEMBER OF THE WOMEN'S TRADE-UNION LEAGUE AND OF THE BRUSH MAKERS' WAGE BOARD AND THE RETAIL STORE WAGE BOARD OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Miss O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I suppose we all agree that the real test of the efficacy of minimum-wage legislation is what it means to the worker, what it means in increased wages, in improved standards of the trade, and what it means in its ability to challenge public attention with reference to the injustices and inequities that existed under the old system, and it seems to me that the last is the most important.

My experience with minimum-wage legislation has been wholly in Massachusetts. The accomplishments of the Massachusetts Minimum Wage Commission have not been altogether successful. Many forces and circumstances have militated against a great accomplishment there. Not the least of those has been the fact that our law is not mandatory. Mr. Holcombe spoke of that this morning. Happily, the law you are considering now does carry a penalty.

Mr. MASON. Under your Massachusetts law if the employers do not pay the price fixed by your board you simply publish the names of those employers?

Miss O'CONNOR. That is all.

Mr. HILLIARD. You have pitiless publicity?

Miss O'CONNOR. Yes. The most potent opposition, however, has come from groups of manufacturers, who have been consistently hostile to the legislation and have year after year made assaults upon it in the legislature of the State with a view to repealing it, and those things have tended to hurt the work of the commission. They have been critics not only of the personnel of the commission but of its function. This has minimized the operation of the law, and they have prevented some wage boards from going into effect, and at present they are challenging the constitutionality of the law in the Massachusetts courts; and, of course, all these things have the effect of decreasing the efficiency of the commission. But on the other hand, it has also reacted to the benefit of the commission and of the legislation, because every element in the community has disapproved of these tactics to prevent the success of the act. It has caused the labor movement to take a more active part in supporting it, and it has caused the fair employer to take a stand in favor of the legislation.

The fact that the commission has been able to withstand these attacks and achieve the results which Mr. Holcombe spoke to you about this morning, I think is a tribute to the essential validity of the principle of the legislation and has shown that the State is responsible for and should insure to the least of the women workers a sum that will permit them to sustain themselves in comfort and health, because upon their slender shoulders after all falls so heavily the burden of industry.

Nothing is more true, I think, than that what we earn determines how we shall live; whether life shall mean something more to us than the four walls of the workshop or the place where we are sheltered; more wages means better food, better clothing, better shelter, and more education and more opportunities for the pursuit of happiness, the eternal quest of the human heart. The world does not owe us a living, said John Mitchell, but we owe it to ourselves, and he spoke out of the experience of the great power of organization. And out of exploitation and hardship the wage-earning women of the country look to you and speak to you, because I think it is as a moral force and as an awakened public conscience that the minimum wage has its chief effectiveness, and of course the value of congressional action on such matters can not be overestimated.

It seems to me the more that is said about low wages and the least that needs to be done from the outside, the more the employer will ask not "How little can you live on," but "What does it cost you to live," and the more the workers will realize that and work together

the more they will expect and the more they will demand of life, and have the divine discontent that is to make humanity dream and do.

I wanted to talk to you about the results of legislation achieved in Massachusetts, but Mr. Holcombe went into that so fully that I will not take the time to say anything further on that.

My service has been on two wage boards, the brush-makers' board and the retail-stores board, two totally different industries. The brush industry in Massachusetts is a very old industry, a struggling and not a very successful one, and, of course, that had its effect on the condition of the workers. Some one said something about managerial inefficiency, and I think the brush industry in Massachusetts is a striking instance of that. The wages were very low indeed, and we were able to make a substantial increase. It is a piece-rate industry, and the increase came in the piece rate. I think the raises amount to as high as 25 and 30 per cent in that industry after the minimum wage law went into effect. There is no question that the minimum wage law has had an indirect effect on industries that have not been directly affected and are not likely to be directly affected.

I am a telephone operator, and we have a strong and powerful organization and have been able to increase our own wages by collective bargaining, and we are not likely to be affected directly by the legislation, and the commission is not likely to fix a minimum wage in that industry, because we are higher paid than the industries in which the commission operates; but I am convinced that because we have a minimum wage in Massachusetts, and because public attention has been focused on wages, it has been of great assistance to us in securing for operators a wage that is placed on a living basis.

The retail stores wage board is a highly successful one, and the report of the board was unanimous; with the exception of the gentleman who represented the five and ten cent stores, every employer on the board voted for the rate, about three years ago, which at that time was about \$8.50. It is significant, I think, and should be emphasized, that the industries which furnish a fertile field for the operations of the commission are the least willing to have the commission operate. For example, the five and ten cent stores notoriously underpaid their girls, and still were not willing to accept the provisions of the act.

Mr. MASON. What do you do when they do not live up to the verdict of the board?

Miss O'CONNOR. Publish their names; but it does not make any difference to the five and ten cent stores.

Mr. MASON. You understand that this bill provides a penalty?

Miss O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. DRANE. What is the average wage paid the girls in the five and ten cent stores?

Miss O'CONNOR. I think \$6 might be called a fair average for our part of the country. I can not speak authoritatively.

Mr. DRANE. You mean in the larger ten-cent stores?

Miss O'CONNOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DRANE. Like Woolworth and that kind of people?

Miss O'CONNOR. Yes. The fact that our law is not mandatory has been, I think, the cause of a great many defects in the operation of

our law, and I am very glad to note that a mandatory clause is contained in this bill. Of course, in the case of the department stores the publication of the names does make a difference, particularly in the case of the better class of stores, the class of stores that make a specialty of good conditions and use that as an advertising medium, the stores that use the consumers' league label; and probably that has had a great deal to do with the fact that the employers in that industry have cooperated with the workers in that industry. Certainly all of the large stores are paying the rate; but in the case of the laundry industry and the candy industry, the employers have not shown any spirit of cooperation, and they have in a great many cases protested the decree, and have not placed it in effect.

Mr. HILLIARD. Are you familiar with the history of the legislation so that you can advise us as to why it was not made mandatory in Massachusetts?

Miss O'CONNOR. There are so many here who are in a better position than I am to tell that, that I would rather leave it to them.

Mr. HILLIARD. It was because of the argument that it was unconstitutional that they wanted to make it merely a matter of suasion?

Miss O'CONNOR. That was regarded as the best thing to do.

Mr. KEATING. I think the committee would be interested in the way you operate on the board.

Miss O'CONNOR. I think the way they are selected in Massachusetts is for the employees in the industry to meet, usually at the initiation of the commission, and nominate six members from their ranks, or they choose representatives from outside to represent them on the board; and the six who represent the employers are nominated in turn by them; and the three who represent the public are named directly by the commission.

You may wonder how I, a telephone operator, happened to represent the brush workers and the retail employees. The brush workers have no organization of any kind; they have not any employees with any experience for representing them. They have not, as in the case of the union, any force behind them to instruct their representatives or to say that the decree after it becomes a law is to be carried into operation; so that it has been customary in Massachusetts for the unorganized employees in an industry to name some one who has had some experience in that form of work, has had some experience in dealing with employers, and the telephone operators have for about six years, and I have had that experience and therefore was nominated in each case by the employees in each industry.

The board meets, and the financial condition of the industry, the costs of living, and the needs of the employee are gone into very thoroughly by each wage board. After a figure is set for the cost of living the ability of the industry to pay such a figure is discussed, this information being usually furnished by the employers, and the decision is reached as to how thoroughly the industry is able to pay a living wage. The decision with the majority report of the wage board is then submitted to the commission, who, if it sees fit, places the decree in effect, usually after a hearing of the interested trade.

Mr. KEATING. Did you find as a result of these conferences between the representatives of the employees and the employers that the two sides came into more harmonious relations?

Miss O'CONNOR. Absolutely, sir. [Applause.]

Mrs. KELLEY. There is here another representative of the Women's Trade Union League, Miss O'Sullivan, a former worker in a department store. May we hear from you, Miss O'Sullivan?

STATEMENT OF MISS MARY O'SULLIVAN, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Miss O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am about to tell you in a few words how I managed to live on \$7 a week. The experience at best was a very unpleasant and sorrowful one, but I am willing to repeat it if it will make you understand or see a little more clearly the necessity for a minimum-wage bill in the District of Columbia. In 1915 it was very hard to get any kind of work in this city, and after several weeks of seeking and pleading I happened to get in a store where I became part of the machinery of that establishment for the handsome sum of \$5 a week. After a short while I moved on and had to start in another store on the same salary. After working for that small wage for six months I one day plead for a raise and was granted one after a week's waiting, amounting to \$1. That gave me \$6 a week, and fate, who plays some interesting tricks at times, decreed that for some months I was to live on \$6 a week.

That is an experience I do not like to talk about. It meant very meager service in a boarding house; it meant walking home from the down-town section to Eighteenth Street NW. in the warm summer, and it meant staying in and doing one's laundry, and it meant an aching heart. After seven or eight months at that wage I felt that I could not really get along any more on it, and I went to my boss again and pleaded with him for another raise. He told me that he would do the very best he could for me. He usually talked to you in that fashion about learning to labor and to wait; and I did wait, and after another two weeks I went back and asked if I was going to get a raise. He was still thinking, and after six weeks of thinking I managed to get another dollar.

Seven dollars a week amounts usually to about \$30 a month. Living at that rate, of course, I could not be in town. So I happened to get board in a home in a suburb, which was charitable enough to take me in for \$20 a month for room and board. Carfare was \$2.50, and, besides, you had to dress and look neat. A girl living by herself and having no other remuneration naturally had no ready cash to buy clothes with. Therefore the store gave us "charges," and a charge costs you about \$8 a month—\$2 a week. That left me 50 cents a week for carfare, amusements, church collections, and other expenses. That shows the conditions of work in a store. In the morning a woman has to do a day's work in dusting and cleaning and such jobs before she starts to hustle around with the usual waiting in the store work of the day.

Now, there are girls in the stores who have been working for seven and eight years, and they are getting \$7 and \$8 a week after all those years of service. There are girls working in the stores to-day, after 12 and 14 years' service, for \$10 a week. The second gentleman that spoke this morning said that the employers had the welfare of their employees at heart. I am very glad to hear it, because the other day in one of the stores one of these gentlemen was walking around, and

he said to some of the girls: "You just wait until the war is over and all these war bureaus have closed, and many of the girls that have left will be glad to come back and you will be very glad to return to a \$4, \$5, and \$6 a week wage."

We may have to go back to the stores again. I am temporarily employed in the Government, and we would ask you to save us from returning to that wage. It is a very little thing to ask, and we hope you will grant it and give us a minimum wage, because it is needed in the District of Columbia and we need it. [Applause.]

Mrs. KELLEY. Mr. McLarin, president of the Federal Employees' Union, will speak next.

STATEMENT OF MR. H. M. McLARIN, PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' UNION.

Mr. McLARIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as representing the Government employees in the city of Washington, I wish to say that the largest group of employees which this legislation will affect in the Government service in the District consists of the helpers and printers' assistants in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. We have over 2,000 girls employed at the rate of \$1.75 a day—\$10.50 a week.

Mr. MASON. Working for the Government?

Mr. McLARIN. Yes, sir. In comparison with the stores and other such places, the laundries, and so on, that is considered preferable work, because that is a higher wage than they get outside. It is only within the last few months that they have had difficulty in maintaining that force, because of the demand for labor outside and in other bureaus of the Government. I think you should give us some action on this bill.

We find it very difficult to get action from Congress which is required to meet the situation, and for that reason I hope that this committee will take an active interest in this measure and let us have legislation on the subject, because it is needed—very badly needed. You have had statistics here this morning from Dr. Meeker showing what it cost to live in the early part of 1917 and the latter part of 1916, and you have been regaled, I am sure, with statistics as to the increase since that time; and the girls who were at that time forced to exist in the circumstances detailed are more than ever put to it now to make ends meet. I have had several instances that I came in personal contact with where girls were living in this situation, earning from \$7 to \$9 or \$10 a week. They absolutely have no opportunity for recreation, pleasure, or anything of that sort. They are literally in a treadmill. They get up in the morning and they have to figure as to what they are going to eat for breakfast. They go to work, and when the work is done there is nothing for them to do, nothing for them to be interested in. They haven't the funds to go to the movies with; they haven't the funds to dress sufficiently to take part in any social activities. Life for them is just one dreary round of necessarily routine work day after day and week after week; no hope in the future, no pleasure in the present.

Mr. MASON. Doesn't the bill that we passed already carry an increase of wages in the bureau there?

Mr. McLARIN. It does to this extent: Their rate is \$1.75 a day. Under the 10 per cent increase they have been getting \$1.92 a day. Now, under the terms of the Keating bill, instead of \$546 a year they will get \$666 a year. That is still only about \$50 a month, you see.

Mr. DRANE. Does the Keating bill fix the wage?

Mr. McLARIN. No, sir; the wages were fixed theretofore at \$1.75, and the Keating bill adds \$10 a month to their rate—\$120 a year—so that gives them approximately \$50 or \$55 a month.

Mr. HILLIARD. I think it might be explained here that Mr. Keating is a versatile gentleman and has other bills other than this one. The Keating bill which is now referred to is one which has already been passed.

Mr. DRANE. The gentleman now speaking, then, does not refer to the bill under consideration?

Mr. HILLIARD. No.

Mr. KEATING. This refers to the bill to increase the salaries of Government employees as passed by the House.

Mr. McLARIN. What I intended to refer to in this particular is that the Government is setting a scale of wages here lower than people can live on, and minimum-wage legislation is needed to affect the Government salaries to the same extent as it is needed to affect the salaries outside; but the Government is such a large employer of labor in this city that unless the Government wages are fixed higher than wages outside the outside wages will drop below any decent minimum, and that has already been the result.

Now, as I say, 70 per cent of these women in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing who are getting \$10.50 a week have dependents. They are either widows with children or they have brothers and sisters dependent on them, or aged mothers and fathers dependent on them. We have taken statistics and have found that 70 per cent of them have some one else dependent on them to take care of out of that \$10.50 a week.

A similar condition—not quite so bad—exists in the Government Printing Office. There the wages are about \$2 a day, but again more than 70 per cent of the women—and there are something like 2,000 at that rate—70 per cent of them have dependents.

Now, as you know, throughout the service we have the charwomen and the attendants and such people as that, who are getting from \$20 to \$40 a month. Those who are getting \$20 are supposed to work only four hours a day, it is true, but there are getting to be more and more of them required to put in a full day's work of eight hours, but still their pay is only \$480 a year. You see that is not possibly a living wage for any one.

The stores here have, it is true, come to the support of this bill, but this legislation is needed and a live commission will be needed to keep the legislation in force.

Now referring further to some of the Government employees, you have over here in the library, as you probably know, a very large number of clerks who are getting \$540 and \$600 a year; it seems a travesty upon humanity to employ intelligent people in that capacity, in a building like the Library of Congress, for that wage.

And there is another group somewhat similar here, of the teachers. Miss Aiton of the graded school teachers is here and will address you.

Gentlemen, I hope that we will be successful in securing this legislation. It is a forward step, as you all know. I had intended to go into the matter more in detail, but you have had so much here this morning that it would be very largely repetition, so I will not take up any more of your time.

Mrs. KELLEY.—I should like to call upon Miss Aiton of the Teachers' Union in the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF MISS M. E. AITON, REPRESENTING THE GRADE TEACHERS' UNION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE PORTNER, FIFTEENTH AND U STREETS NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Miss AITON. So much has been said already that it seems to me there is very little I can add.

There is just one point that I should like to make, however. In getting the budget together, to use before the Appropriations Committee for the District, we found that many of the teachers whose salaries are far higher, of course, than many of these industrial workers, are not able to live on the salary they get. The minimum that we receive is \$500 a year, about \$10 a week. We find that none of the assistants who are getting that—practically none of them—are living on that salary, and we find that of our teachers 60 per cent of all the elementary teachers are in debt, as far as we have gotten the record. The one point I want to make is that if these women who have or should have been trained to live intelligently, are not able to live on these very much larger salaries, certainly the greatest thought should be given to other girls who need to have some minimum wage provided. We have found that it is so impossible to live on these low salaries that in working on this question I have wondered how girls who have these very, very small salaries could live at all; and it seemed to me that we ought to do all we could to aid in getting a minimum wage for these people who are serving us and serving all the world.

Mr. DRANE. What is the maximum wage for teachers?

Miss AITON. The maximum wage for elementary teachers is \$1,300, I think, for the principals. Of course, we are being taken care of to some extent just now. We do not know to what extent. We are trusting to Congress for that.

Mr. DRANE. How many school months do they have?

Miss AITON. Nine school months. The teachers, of course, do many things to supplement their salaries, but they are fitted to do those things.

Mr. DRANE. And what are the hours per day?

Miss AITON. The hours are from 9 to 3 for the all-day teachers, but that does not by any means cover the hours she works.

Mr. DRANE. Yes; I understand that.

Miss AITON. That is the hours they spend with the children. I think that we can not give our hours, because they are very apt to be indefinite. We work as long as there is work for us to do.

Mr. DRANE. I speak of the hours of the school session?

Miss AITON. Then, in addition to the hours of the school session we are called upon to attend lectures and meetings outside of those hours, and they come at whatever time we are called for.

Mr. HILLIARD. Necessarily you are constantly making preparation?

Miss AITON. Certainly. There are hours of preparation, of course, throughout all the schools.

I thank you.

Mrs. KELLEY. There are several organizations in the District whose representatives are here. I should like to call upon Mr. Walter S. Ufford, of the Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis.

STATEMENT OF MR. WALTER S. UFFORD, REPRESENTING THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TUBERCULOSIS, THE ASSOCIATED CHARITIES, AND THE MONDAY EVENING CLUB, 923 H STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. UFFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, may I speak first for the Monday Evening Club, simply to bear our testimony to the interest in this bill?

Mr. McKelway was to have represented the club. He was appointed last evening to do so, but I will do so to-day. That is a club of social workers representing the paid workers in the social-service field and many volunteers, a club of about 400, and we are very much interested in measures of this character that will improve the living conditions of working people in the District of Columbia.

I am secretary of the Associated Charities, and we, too, are interested in this bill. As one of the speakers said this morning, this is not a question of philanthropy, but we do believe that if we can have a living wage for the people who are at work it will affect our work. We have seen it this year, that notwithstanding the increased cost of living, employment has been so continuous that there was no excuse for any able-bodied person to say that he was out of work. A review of our last six months' work, notwithstanding this severe winter, has shown us a great reduction—a considerable reduction at least—in the number of families that have been to us for care. The families that are coming to us now are subnormal either in the point of view of health, or perhaps through neglect, through some physical or moral condition which needs readjustment and reconstruction. Of course, no charitable organization can attempt to subsidize in the matter of wages. It is altogether too big a problem. But in the preparation of our family budget, in studying as we do what is the margin between self-support on the part of the family and their necessities, we have often discovered in the District, owing to the low wages paid in domestic service, in the laundries, and in many of these other occupations that have been mentioned here—we have often discovered that the total of the family income was very much below what it should be.

We are interested in this from another angle. We believe that a person should be worth what he is paid, and we believe that the influence of this legislation will all come back to the schools and stimulate immensely vocational training in the schools. Our boys and girls will come out of school better prepared to earn this wage, and because of their value to their employers they will be more valuable to themselves; they will be more valuable to the city.

The Associated Charities, the Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, the Monday Evening Club, and I think we can safely say all the social service organizations of the District of Columbia are a unit in favor of this legislation.

Mrs. KELLEY. The last speaker of the afternoon is Mrs. Raymond Morgan, of the District of Columbia Branch of the Collegiate Alumnae. I could not call on Mrs. Morgan this morning. Is she present? [There was no response.]

That closes our list of speakers. Are there any other representatives of District of Columbia organizations who have come with the idea of supporting this bill? If not, Mr. Chairman, that is the end of our list.

Mr. HILLARD. Are there any here who would like to speak in opposition to the measure? [After a pause.] It would seem that none such are present.

Mr. KEATING. In behalf of those interested, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for the courtesy extended us in this hearing.

Mr. HILLIARD. In behalf of the committee I would like to say that we are most grateful indeed to those who have appeared. We have learned much from what you have brought to us here. We are more and more constrained to the belief that in a democracy education is most essential, and we have learned too that simply to be educated that we may live off our fellows is not any longer the purpose of education. The purpose of education is that we may help everybody, and this bill we think—I think at least—points in that direction. [Applause.]

(Whereupon, at 3.20 o'clock p. m. the committee adjourned.)

Y 4.D 63/ 1:M 66/10 C.1
Minimum wage for women
Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 045 215 717

DATE DUE

DATE DUE			

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004

